United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/32/VNM/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
6 November 2018

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-second session
21 January1 February 2019

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Viet Nam*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 77 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[2] and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[3]

2. JS15 recommended that Viet Nam ratify the two Optional Protocols to ICCPR, OP-CAT, OP-CEDAW, OP-ICESCR, OP-ICRPD, OP-CRC-IC, and withdraw reservations to ICERD and recognize the CAT competence following articles 20 and 30 of the Convention.[4] JS19[5] and JS14[6] recommended the ratification of ICRMW and of other optional protocols related to the complaint and communication procedure.

3. AI recommended ratifying and implementing the OP-CAT, by establishing an independent and well-resourced National Preventive Mechanisms in accordance with the Protocol.[7] AI recommended ratifying, without reservations, the Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.[8]

4. JS4 recommended recognising the competence of CEDAW to receive individual complaints.[9]

5. JS9 recommended ratifying and implementing the ICRMW and ICPPED and optional protocols related to grievance and information on violations of rights under these conventions.[10]

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

GE.18-18686(E)
1818686

Please recycle

6. JS2 recommended that Viet Nam accede to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a Communications Procedure[11], and ratify the United Nations World Tourism Organization Framework Convention on Tourism Ethics.[12]

7. JS18 recommended that Viet Nam ratify the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness and the 1951 Convention relating the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol.[13]

8. JS9[14], JS14[15] and HRW[16] recommended ensuring freedom of association of workers by soon ratifying the Convention on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize, 1948 (ILO no. 87) and the Convention on the Right to Organize and Collective, 1949 (ILO no. 98). JS7 recommended ratifying ILO Convention no. 87.[17] JS14 also recommended that Viet Nam ratify the ILO Conventions on the Abolition of Forced Labour (no. 105), on Domestic Workers (no. 189).[18]

9. JS9 recommended inviting the Working Group on the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights to conduct a review of the electronics industry and that Viet Nam collaborate with the ILO on reporting on electronics industry workers' health information.[19]

10. UNESCO recommended ratifying the ILO Convention no.169 and implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.[20]

11. JS1[21], JS14[22] and JS15[23] recommended issuing standing invitations to United Nations special procedures. AI[24] and FN[25] recommended that Viet Nam co-operate with the United Nations human rights mechanisms, in particular the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders. JS4 recommended extending invitations to the Special rapporteur on the rights to freedom of association and peaceful assembly; Special rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences; and the Working group on discrimination against women de jury and de facto.[26] JS13 invited the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity to visit Viet Nam.[27] FN recommended that Viet Nam invite the Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression and opinion, the Special Rapporteur on the freedom of peaceful assembly and association, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention for country visits.[28] WEA recommended inviting the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief for a follow-up visit.[29]

12. JS1 recommended that Viet Nam encourage non-state actors to engage with treaty bodies, the UPR and special procedures, and that it seek technical cooperation from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights.[30] AI made a similar recommendation.[31]

13. ICAN noted with appreciation that Viet Nam ratified the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons on 17 May 2018.[32]

B. National human rights framework[33]

14. JS15 stressed that there was no independent national human rights institution in Viet Nam, despite commitments with different United Nations human rights mechanisms and recommendations.[34] JS15[35] and JS4[36] recommended establishing an independent national human rights institution following the Paris Principles.

15. JS15 also recommended that Viet Nam adopt a comprehensive national action plan on the implementation of human rights commitments, including UPR, treaty bodies and special procedures' recommendations.[37]

16. Noting that Viet Nam Constitution provided scope to live in peace in dignified way to the Vietnamese people, ISCUF stated that shortcomings still remained.[38] JS15 referred to the absence of a Constitutional Court in Viet Nam.[39] VNAPC noted that although the Constitution protect the fundamental rights of Vietnamese citizens, the Government attacked all rights exercised contrary to its interests.[40] VNAPC recommended establishing

an independent, permanent human rights monitoring body; and amending the Constitution to allow a multi-party political system.[41]

17. VBF stated that the Constitution promoted the building of a socialist rule-of-law state in which human rights were recognized, protected and guaranteed.[42]

18. JS12 recommended reviewing the Constitution to ensure it conforms to Vietnam's obligations under the ICCPR, ICESCR, and other key international human rights standards.[43]

19. JS10 stated that Vietnam's National Assembly passed the Law on Belief and Religion in November 2016, which on the one hand it expanded the space for registered religious organizations to operate in, and on the other hand, it placed greater restrictions on non-registered, independent religions.[44] WEA recommended allowing all unregistered religious groups to freely exercise their freedom of religion or belief.[45] JS7[46] and WEA[47] recommended revising the Law on Belief and Religion, particularly Articles 43 and 45 according to WEA,[48] to ensure its compliance with relevant international standards. UNPO made a similar recommendation.[49]

20. JS9 recommended developing and implementing by 2019 a national standard for labour contracts taking into account ILO standards.[50] JS7 recommended revising existing labour laws to recognise the right to freedom of association, and guarantee the independent functioning of autonomous trade unions.[51]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[52]

21. JS5 recommended adopting a law on anti-discrimination in accordance with Article 1 of CEDAW and Article 2 of the ICCPR, ICESCR, CERD, CRC and CRPD; revising all discriminatory laws and regulations to comply with international human rights standards;[53] and providing accessible complaint mechanism for victims of gender discrimination and their representatives.[54] JS15 made a similar recommendation.[55] JS14 recommended implementing the accepted recommendation 143.86 regarding the elimination of discrimination against vulnerable groups.[56]

22. JS3 noted positive steps taken on LGBTI persons' rights,[57] but legal and policy reforms were still needed.[58] iSEE[59] and JS15[60] noted that the LBGTI community faced low recognition, discrimination, and difficulties in mobilization of resources. HIV stigma and discrimination existed in workplace and media.[61] iSEE[62] and JS3[63] recommended that Viet Nam pass laws against discrimination of sexual orientation and gender identity. JS6 recommended that Viet Nam adopt laws that recognize and realize the rights of transgender/transsexual people and legalize sex work.[64]

23. JS16 said that people who used drugs or were involved in the drug market endured stigmatisation, marginalisation and prosecution.[65]

24. VAE2019 noted that in August 2016, the Prime Minister adopted the project on expansion of the Intergenerational Self-help Club, for 2016-2020, to implement the National Plan of Action on serving older persons.[66]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[67]

25. NNIA indicated that the war left a legacy of chemical and other warfare that continued to affect the Vietnamese people today. Agent Orange has affected from 3 to 4.8 million of Vietnamese and contaminated part of the territory.[68] AIPF noted that Vietnam was among the top 20 most polluted countries on earth, impacting children's health and future chances in life.[69]

26. AI stated that social and environmental activists, campaigning in the aftermath of the 2016 environmental disaster, were particularly targeted and recommended ensuring prompt and impartial investigations into reports of excessive use of force by the police in this regard.[70] JS19 stated that human rights impact assessment should be a mandatory step in the evaluation for all international trade and investment agreements.[71]

27. CECR mentioned that the message of water pollution control had been conveyed through national press and television.[72] WARECOD stated that despite Vietnam had created an open environment for receiving and responding to citizens' information, the consultation process on development projects did not adequately reflect the opinion of affected communities.[73]

28. AAPSO indicated that continuous legal reform was being made to liberalise the business environment, improve growth, productivity and competitiveness.[74]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[75]

29. Reprieve expressed great concern that although Viet Nam removed the death penalty for some offences, death penalty still applied to offences including freedom of expression, the right to peaceful assembly and other internationally recognised rights.[76]

30. AI stated that figures on the use of the death penalty continued to be classified as a state secret,[77] and recommended to abolish the death penalty for all crimes.[78] JS15 stated that the application of the capital punishment remained non-transparent and that executions were conducted with no representation of civilian witness.[79] Various stakeholders recommended that Viet Nam impose a moratorium on executions with the goal of abolishing the death penalty.[80] JS15 recommended that Viet Nam further reduce the number of crimes subject to the death penalty, especially those non-violent and political crimes.[81] JS16 recommended removing drug-related offences from the list of crimes punishable by death.[82]

31. VN-CAT[83] and VPAFW[84] expressed concern for the number of deaths in police custody. WEA recommended appointing an independent commission to investigate suspected cases of torture, degrading treatments and deaths in police custody and detention.[85]

32. FLD reported that once convicted and sentenced, human rights defenders were subject to harsh conditions in prison, including verbal abuse, harassment and threats. Requests to transfer cells are ignored.[86] TSC made a similar comment.[87] AI[88], BPSOS[89], CSW[90], HRW[91], FN[92] and JS12[93] recommended that Viet Nam immediately and unconditionally release all prisoners of conscience and human rights defenders, bloggers, journalists, religious and political dissidents and those detained or imprisoned simply for exercising their right to peaceful assembly.

33. AI recommended ending the practice of prolonged solitary confinement and ensuring that all disciplinary measures conform to international law and standards, including the Nelson Mandela Rules; ending the practice of incommunicado detention; ending the practice of punitive transfers of all detainees and prisoners and ensure that prisoners are allocated, to the extent possible, to prisons close to their homes.[94] BPSOS[95] and VN-CAT[96] made similar statements. JS16 reported that the prison population was critically underserved.[97] JS17 was concerned about the poor living conditions of death row inmates, and the lack of independent observation.[98] JS12 recommended that Viet Nam conform to the UN Standard Minimum Rules on the Treatment of Prisoners, abolish forced labor and end practices of torture and ill-treatment of prisoners.[99] UNPO[100] and JS8[101] made similar recommendations.

34. JS16 referred to credible reports of inhuman and degrading treatment, physical abuse, and forced labour in treatment, education and social labour centres[102] where "drug addicts" individuals, including children, are forcibly detained for up to two years.[103]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[104]

35. VPDF noted that a variety of laws had been adopted by the National Assembly (2015 Penal Code, 2015 Code of Criminal Procedure, 2015 Civil Code, 2015 Code of Civil Procedure, Press Law, 2016 Law on Access to Information, 2015 Law on Referendum, Law on Belief and Religion, etc), in consultation with the civil society.[105] JS15 recommended amending the Law on Organization of People's Court to guarantee the independence of the judicial system.[106] JS20 recommended that Viet Nam guarantee the full independence and safety of lawyers and their effective protection against any form of retaliation.[107]

36. HRW recommended allowing all people detained to have immediate access to legal counsel upon being arrested;[108] and establishing an independent police complaints commission to accept complaints from the public and to provide oversight over the professional responsibility unit of the police.[109]

37. VN-CAT stated that while the legal framework guaranteed protection against violence, torture, inhuman or degrading treatment, cover-up and impunity were prevalent at all levels of the Government.[110] BPSOS[111] and VN-CAT[112] recommended investigating and prosecuting all perpetrators of torture, and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

38. VPDF noted that the law on temporary detention and custody provided for the rights of detainees, including meetings with relatives and lawyers, access information, complain and denounce any violation of any regulation on temporary detention. No punishment that violates the rights of detainees were allowed. Detainees were fully covered with health and medical care and vocational guidance.[113] JS17 recommended that Viet Nam further undergo reforms regarding the code of criminal procedures to ensure it follows the international standards.[114]

39. IELM noted that the level of public legal education remained low in Viet Nam, and recommended that Viet Nam strengthen legal awareness using mass media.[115]

40. RTCCD stated that widespread and deep-rooted corruption existed in Viet Nam. The corruption lead to business enterprises' intervention in public life and hindered the administrative legal system action.[116]

41. UNJC indicated that the Judicial Reform Strategy until 2020, together with legislative reforms in procedural matters, guaranteed a broader protection through, inter alia, such measures as the principle of judicial independence; the respect of the right to defense; the establishment of a broad set of remedies against judicial resolutions; the obligation of the judges to strictly assess the evidence presented at trial and obtained by lawful means.[117]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[118]

42. JS11 stated that Vietnamese government needed to make substantial changes to its current legal system to protect citizens' privacy and their freedom of thought and expression.[119] JS11 recommended amending the 2015 Criminal Procedures Code to grant the People's Courts system the power of approving and/or rejecting all kinds of surveillance orders.[120] According to JS20, articles 109 and 117 of the Penal Code were frequently invoked to imprison lawyers, bloggers and human rights defenders for the peaceful exercise of their right to free expression.[121] HRW recommended repealing articles 109, 116, 117, 118 and 331 of the Penal Code and bring it in conformity with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.[122]

43. VNAPC stated that there was complete censorship and control over the flow of information. Furthermore, the Vietnamese military created a special unit to fight views published online that are against dominant political party's interests,[123] which, according to JS7, maintained its control over all public affairs and prohibited the establishment or operation of independent political parties, labour unions and CSOs.[124] JS8[125] and FLD[126] recommended releasing all journalists, bloggers, human rights defenders, and religious and social activists immediately and unconditionally, as well as conducting independent investigations into the harassment of activists.

44. AN[127], HRW[128] and VNAPC[129] noted that the Government continued to arrest and jail human rights bloggers and activists. Over 20 people were sentenced to prison for at least 9 years as they posted views that defamed the Government of Viet Nam on the internet.[130] JS8 was concerned that that since 2014, there were severe restrictions on freedoms of expression and information and a crackdown on journalists, bloggers and human rights defenders over the past years.[131] JS8 also stated that an amended Press Law was passed in 2016,[132] maintaining the State's authority over the press,[133] and preventing journalists from reporting on politically sensitive issues and publishing views critical of the State.[134]

45. WPC stated that Viet Nam's press and media have become a forum for exchanges regarding the supervision of the State's activities, thus contributing to the fight against corruption and wrongdoings in Viet Nam.[135]

46. JS15 stated that the revised Press Law did not explicitly recognise private-owned press.[136] JS15,[137] JS7[138] and HRW[139] recommended adopting legislation authorising the publication of independent, privately run newspapers and magazines, and ensuring that journalists and bloggers may work freely and without fear of criminalisation and threats for expressing critical opinions or covering sensitive subjects.[140]

47. JS11 indicated that in June 2018 mass demonstrations broke out in major cities across Vietnam to protest against the draft Cybersecurity Law and the draft Special Economic Zones Law. Hundreds of demonstrators were arrested.[141] JS19 stated that the adoption of a cybersecurity law was an attempt by the Government to further tighten control of the internet and global tech companies, and a further crackdown on dissent.[142] TSC stated that Government took control over free speech, partly using the cybersecurity law, which forced companies to hand over users' personal information online.[143] AN recommended that on-line contents not be removed until it was adjudicated as being illegal, in line with international standards.[144] JS11 recommended removing provisions in the Cybersecurity Law that prohibit "to distort history, deny revolutionary achievements, [or] undermine national solidarity".[145] HRW,[146] JS15[147], FN[148] and FLD[149] made a similar recommendation.

48 Red Communication recommended creating mechanisms to improve access to information by the public.[150]

49. ADF International[151], BPSOS[152], JS12[153], JS7[154] and CSW[155] stated that there was a government control over religious activities in Vietnam as the Government enacted the new Law on Belief, which subjected religious activities to tighter control. In 2017, hundreds of Christians and Buddhists suffered from persecution by state agents. The victims had their personal items/homes destroyed, property seized and were subjected to severe violence, sham trials, and death. CSW recommended that Vietnam ensure that torture and ill-treatment cease immediately, and that no citizen be detained incommunicado.[156] ADF International recommended that Viet Nam remove burdensome registration requirements, punish all religiously motivated violence and remove prohibitions on religious communities.[157] BPSOS[158] and CSW[159] recommended that registration of religious organizations be optional, instead of required, so as to eliminate obstacles and restrictions to the right to freedom of religion or belief.

50. CSVC stated that the majority of Vietnamese Catholics had confidence on the people's administration and expected that their needs would be taken care of in accordance with the laws.[160] JS10 stated that local and provincial governments have used violence against Hmong Christians who refused to renounce their faith[161] and recommended investigating all reported incidents of forced renunciation of faith and prosecute responsible officials.[162] JS10 also stated that the Government, using economic development as pretext, has targeted Buddhist temples not submitted to government control.[163] VN-CAT indicated that radical groups gathered in large number and attacked Catholic priests and parishioners while local police remained idle.[164] WEA recommended promoting a spirit of respect and tolerance, stopping State and media propaganda against religious minorities and unrecognized religious groups.[165]

51. JS7 stated that, out of 37 recommendations relating to civil society space made at the second cycle, the Government has partially implemented six recommendations and not

implemented the remaining 31. Implementation gaps were found regarding the rights to the freedoms of association, peaceful assembly and expression and the protection of human rights defenders and bloggers.[166] JS15 made a similar statement.[167] VNAPC noted that the free exercise of the right to peaceful assembly faced security force's harassment, beating, and arbitrary arrest.[168] FLD reported that human rights defenders gathering outside courthouses during trials of other defenders were subject to mass-arrest, arbitrary detention and police violence.[169] JS15 recommended that in adopting the Law on Associations, Viet Nam took into account recommendations from treaty bodies, the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Association and Assembly, and the UPR.[170] JS15 further recommended investigating allegations on the excessive use of force in managing demonstrations and protests.[171]

52. JS5 recommended amending the conditions and criteria for candidates of the National Assembly and People's Council delegates to ensure the right to stand for election.[172] JS15 recommended that Viet Nam initiate a legal reform to ensure free and fair election.[173]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[174]

53. CSDM noted that the large majority of women victims of trafficking were ethnic minorities' women, who were widely marginalized.[175]

Right to privacy and family life[176]

54. AN stated that in 2015, Government passed the Law on Network Information Security to ensure that the collection of personal information required the consent of the individual.[177] AN recommended that the Government do not force or request online platforms to undertake actions regarding user data disclosure or other surveillance measures.[178]

55. JS18 noted that marginalised and disadvantaged groups experienced barriers in accessing birth registration.[179] and recommended that Viet Nam ensure universal birth registration.[180]

56. A number of stakeholders noted that the Government did not formally recognise same-sex marriages, and same-sex couples were not afforded the legal protections enjoyed by heterosexual married couples.[181] and recommended that Viet Nam explicitly legalise same-sex marriage in the Law on Marriage and Family.[182]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[183]

57. JS14 noted that two thirds of the total workforce in Viet Nam was working in the informal sector and were not protected by labour laws. It recommended that the revised Labour Code include informal workers.[184]

58. JS14 said that despite progress made, the current minimum wage still lacked minimum living needs. It recommended that the minimum wages ensured the basic living needs of employees and their families and that Viet Nam implemented the accepted recommendation 143.189 on mitigating income inequalities.[185]

59. JS15 said that the right of workers to freely form and join trade union was not recognised properly in the Constitution 2013 and in the Law on Trade Union,[186] and recommended that employees were allowed to freely form or join independent trade union of their choice.[187]

60. MDRI noted a lack of skilled workers. Employees in urban areas faced difficulties obtaining vocational training and employment protection.[188]

Right to an adequate standard of living[189]

61. VGCL stated that the first and foremost right of Vietnamese citizens and working people was the right to improved living conditions and safe working conditions.[190]

AIPSO[191], VPC[192] and AAPSO[193] indicated that the Vietnamese Government has initiated many other programs regarding poverty reduction, food security and public health with the aim at ensuring social justice. CCDS[194] and CPAPD[195] noted that Vietnam has made remarkable progress in building its economy, reducing poverty, and raising the standard of living. FMC stated that the economic growth has shown a 6 percent rise as an annual average, a process in which women made large contributions.[196]

62. JS19 urged the Government to continue its effort regarding accepted recommendations of the previous cycle, namely recommendation 143.215: combat poverty among migrant workers.[197]

63. VAE2019 indicated that nearly 2.5 million elders have been participating in production generating income, especially farms production and service facilities.[198]

Right to health[199]

64. VAVA indicated that the Remedy Program of toxic chemical – agent orange and dioxin - in Viet Nam aimed to restore the living environment for the people; provide healthcare for the victims and prioritize improving living condition for the victims and their families.[200] VNRC made a similar statement.[201] VAVA noted that the Government played a major role in organizing community healthcare for the victims of toxic chemicals through funding healthcare projects and providing 100% health insurance.[202]

65. JS4 recommended providing safe and efficient maternal health services based on the traditions and custom, cultural values and diverse needs of ethnic minority communities.[203]

66. JS16 informed about steps undertaken towards embracing a health-based approach to drug use.[204] It recommended that Viet Nam provide harm reduction services across the country, including in detention settings and in the most remote areas.[205]

67. SCDI noted that although Vietnamese government made a breakthrough in reducing health insurance cost, health care was still very challenging to get, especially for people who are affected by HIV, tuberculosis and malaria.[206] iSEE stated that Viet Nam aimed to end AIDS by 2030 and will provide free HIV treatment from January 2019.[207]

Right to education[208]

68. JS1 indicated that Viet Nam accomplished the universality of primary and secondary education and improved educational infrastructures.[209] VPC stated that in 2016, the literacy rate of people aged 15-35 years and 15-60 years nationwide was 98.69 percent and 97.73 percent, respectively.[210]

69. JS15 recommended that Viet Nam ensure elementary and secondary education free of charge, ensure quality of education, expand mother-tongue and bi-lingual education programs for ethnic minorities.[211] JS18 recommended that all children have access to education, irrespective of their documentation status.[212]

70. CSHRS[213] and WPC[214] indicated that Vietnam strengthened human rights education and dissemination. CHD noted that human rights projects needed more financial support from the Government, and governmental agencies lacked knowledge on human rights.[215]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[216]

71. CWDF[217], SRD,[218] CPAPD[219] and AIPSO[220] stated that Viet Nam has made some remarkable achievements in gender equality, and women play important roles in the society. CCDS stated that 28% of the members of the Vietnam parliament are women.[221] A similar figure was given by VPC.[222] CSHRS noted that despite Viet Nam legally elaborated gender equality through government agendas, it had difficulties in ensuring gender equality.[223] JS4 recommended revising all gender discriminatory laws and regulations to comply with international human rights standards.[224] JS1 noted the National Strategy on Gender Equality (2011-2020).[225]

72. CWDF[226] and VWU[227] noted that women still face occupational segregation, gender pay gap and male preference. CWDF further illustrated that rural women's income and social security level were low. CWDF recommended that Viet Nam continue to narrow gender pay gap, raise women's income and help women have equal rights with other citizens.[228] JS14 recommended that the revised Labour Code ensure substantial gender equality.[229] JS5[230], JS14[231] and JS4[232] recommended including a specific definition on "sexual harassment" and sanctions against sexual harassment at workplace.

73. SRD recommended that Vietnamese government continue to facilitate projects on gender equality; empower the Women's Union; and create more opportunities for local NGOs to raise their voice.[233]

74. VWU noted that rural women, ethnic minority women and disadvantaged women have limited access to information technology, education, healthcare services, and vocational training.[234]

75. JS6 stated that though Vietnam has laws on domestic violence and other forms of violence including rape and sexual assaults, these laws seem not be very effective as the conviction rate is very low.[235] VWU made a similar statement.[236] JS6 recommended improving the effectiveness and friendliness of the justice system and supporting services on gender-based violence, and making sure that the number of shelter meets the needs of victims of violence.[237]

76. FMC noted that the Government has worked in compliance with the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and with goals related to the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development, enabling Vietnamese women to participate in the development of the nation.[238]

Children[239]

77. JS2 indicated that Viet Nam enacted a new Criminal Code in January 2018, which strengthened child protection by criminalising a broader array of conducts related to sexual exploitation of children, and introducing more severe penalties for child marriage and trafficking.[240] JS2 recommended taking legislative measures to raise the legal age of a child to 18, in compliance with the CRC, and amend all the relevant provisions, notably in the new Criminal Code, to protect all children under the age of 18 from sexual exploitation and trafficking.[241] JS19 urged the Government to double its efforts regarding accepted recommendations of the previous UPR cycle on child trafficking.[242]

78. RTCCD noted that children in Viet Nam faced abuses, including sexual abuses.[243] JS2 recommended continuing to develop recovery and reintegration programmes for child victims of sexual exploitation and guarantee them access to compensation.[244] VACR recommended disseminating and promoting legislation on children; and amending provisions related to child sexual abuse.[245]

79. CSDS noted that Viet Nam has made achievements relating to youth participation in politics. In 2016, the Ministry of Planning and Investment invited several youth leaders to express their voices about new policies on internet.[246] CPAPD noted that in June 2018, Viet Nam launched the first council of children.[247] JS1 noted the Program for the Promotion of children's right to participate in matters related to Childhood 2016-2020 plan.[248]

80. VACR noted that while the wellbeing of children has been improving, yet there were challenges in implementing children's rights regarding access to quality education and medical services in rural areas.

81. GIEACPC noted that the Child Law 2016 did not send a clear message that all corporal punishment, however light, was prohibited. Although corporal punishment in Viet Nam was prohibited in schools and in the penal system, there was no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in the home, and in alternative and day care settings.[249]

Persons with disabilities[250]

82. Viethealth[251] and DRD[252] noted that in 2015 the Prime Minister established the National Committee for Disability and approved the plan of implementation of the

Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability in 2016. Viethealth recommended increasing the budget for policies related to the rights of persons with disabilities, especially at local level.[253]

83. ASVDO recommended promoting communication, education and capacity building on law enforcement for the rights of person with disabilities and children's rights; preventing child abuse, discrimination and stigmatization of persons with disabilities; strengthening support to organizations working in this field and increasing investment resources for children.[254]

Minorities and indigenous peoples[255]

84. JS18 stressed that ethnic and religious minorities faced significant discrimination.[256] CSDM noted that there were increasing gaps in economic and social development between ethnic minorities and other populations. Poverty incidence in minorities was higher.[257] CSDM also indicated that all ethnic minorities had Vietnamese citizenship, and Vietnam's Constitution recognized that all people have equal rights. A ministry-level agency, the Committee on Ethnic Minority Affairs, was in charge of ethnic minority affairs.[258]

85. VPDF indicated that the Government has been focusing on narrowing down the socio-economic gaps among ethnic communities by issuing plans and policies, with achievement in the reduction of poverty, education, information access and health national standards.[259] TSC recommended taking measures to narrow the economic inequality and to improve the living standards in minority regions.[260]

86. TSC noted that Viet Nam government has not yet recognized Tai as indigenous people. Tai group had no voice in the governance: the Government exploited Tai people's lands and resources with little compensation. TSC recommended that Viet Nam give Tai people the right to self-determination; allow minority communities to be involved in decision-making processes and create effective mechanisms to compensate for loss of lands and livelihood.[261]

87 KKF[262] and UNPO[263] stated that Viet Nam Government denied the Khmer-Krom people's identity as indigenous peoples, through control of religious activities, education, local economy, and access to health system. KKF recommended that Viet Nam recognize Khmer-Krom as indigenous peoples; allow public schools to teach Khmer-Krom culture and language; allow Khmer-Krom to conduct religious activities; and provide free and fair healthcare system to Khmer-Krom patients.[264]

88. JS18 recommended that Viet Nam guarantee human rights without discrimination, particularly to ethnic and religious minorities such as the H'Mong and Montagnard communities.[265]

89. VPC noted that 86 deputies (17.3 percent) to the 14th National Assembly (2016-2021) belonged to ethnic minorities.[266]

90. VFU recommended that the Government intensify the training and fostering of knowledge on public relations and people mobilization for officials working on ethnic and religious affairs.[267]

Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[268]

91 JS18 recommended that Viet Nam develop civil documentation and registration campaigns that support people to acquire and confirm citizenship, namely populations residing in border areas and in remote locations.[269]

92. JS18 referred to the restrictive residential registration system, which determined access to social services, land and utilities.[270] It recommended that Viet Nam reform the residential registration system.[271] JS14 recommended eliminating discrimination in access to public services for migrant workers.[272]

93. JS9 indicated that in 2017 there were 134,000 Vietnamese overseas migrant workers including about 40% female. Most migrant women worked as foreign domestic workers.[273]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Individual submissions:

AAPSO	Afro Asian People's Solidarity Organization (El Cairo, Egypt);
ADF International	Alliance Defending Freedom International, (Vienna, Austria);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
AIPF	AIP Foundation, (Hanoi, Vietnam);
AIPSO	All India's People Solidarity Organization (New Delhi, India)
AN	Access Now, (New York, United States);
ASVDO	Association in Support of Vietnamese Disability and Orphans (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
BPSOS	Boat People SOS (Falls Church, Virginia, the United States of America) ;
CCDS	Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism, (San Francisco, the United States of America);
CECR	Center for Environment and Community Research (Hanoi, Viet Nam)
CHD	Center for health Consultation and Community Development, (HCM City, Vietnam);
CPAPD	Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament,
CSDM	The Center for Sustainable Development in Mountainous Areas, (Hanoi, Vietnam);
CSDS	Center for Sustainable Development Studies, (Hanoi, Vietnam);
CSHRS	China Society for Human Rights Studies, (Beijing, China);
CSVC	The Committee for Solidarity of Vietnamese Catholics, (Hanoi, Vietnam);
CSW	Christian Solidarity Worldwide, (New Malden, United Kingdom);
CWDF	All-China Women's Federation, (Beijing, China);
DDR	Disability Research and Capacity Development Centre (Ho Chi Minh, Viet Nam);
FLD	Front Line Defender (Dublin, Ireland);
FMC	Federacion de Mujeres Cubanas, Havana (Cuba);
FN	Freedom Now (Washington DC, the United States of America);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to end All Corporal Punishment of Children (London, United Kingdom);
HRW	Human Rights Watch (Geneva, Switzerland);
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons;
IELM	Institute of Economics, Law and Management, (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
ISCUF	Indian Society For Cultural Cooperation & Friendship, (New Delhi, India);
iSEE	Institute for Studies of Society, Economy and Environment, (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
KKF	Khmers Kampuchea-Krom Federation, (Pennsauken, United States);
LIV	Legal Initiatives for Viet Nam, (Taipei City, Republic of China);
MDRI	Mekong Development Research Institute (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
NNIA	National Network of Indochina Activists (New York, the United States of America);
RED	Communication Research on Development Communication, (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
REPRIEVE	Reprieve, (London, United Kingdom);
RTCCD	Research and Training Center for Community Development, (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
SCDI	Center for Supporting Community Development Initiatives, (Hanoi, Viet Nam);

SRD	Sustainable Rural Development, (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
TSC	Tai Studies Center, (Des Moines, the United States of America);
UNPO	Unrepresented Nations & Peoples Organization, (The Hague, The Netherlands)
UNJC	National Union of Jurists of Cuba, (Havana, Cuba)
VACR	Vietnam Association for Protection of Child's Rights (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VAE2019	Hoinguoicaotuoi, (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VAVA	Hoi Nan nhan chat doc da cam/Dioxin Viet Nam, (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VAPC	Vietnamese Abroad PEN Centre (Toronto, Canada);
VBF	Viet Nam Bar Federation (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VFU	Viet Nam Farmers' Union (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VGCL	Viet Nam General Confederation of Labour (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VIETHEALTH	Sustainable Health Development Center (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VN-CAT	Viet Nam Coalition Against Torture (Sugar Hill, the United States of America);
VNCR	Viet Nam Red Cross Society (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VPAFW	Viet Nam for Progress (Town of Mount Royal, Quebec, Canada);
VPDF	Viet Nam Peace and Development Foundation (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VPC	Viet Nam Peace Committee (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
VWU	Viet Nam Women Union (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
WEA	World Evangelical Alliance, (Geneva, Switzerland);
WARECOD	Water Resources Conservation and Development (Hanoi, Viet Nam);
WPC	World Peace Council (Athens, Greece).

Joint submissions:

JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by**: Asociacion Cubana de las Naciones Unidas, La Habana, (Cuba);
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by**: ECPAT International and Vietnam Association for Protection of Child's Rights, Bangkok, (Thailand);
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by**: Kaleidoscope Australia Human Rights Foundation, Institute for Studies of Society, Economics and the Environment, Clayton Victoria (Australia);
JS4	**Joint submission 4 submitted by**: Center for Education Promotion and Empowerment of Women, Inclusive Development action, Research center for Gender, Family and Environment in Development, Women Who Make a Difference Hanoi, (Viet Nam);
JS5	**Joint submission 5 submitted by**: Center for Education Promotion and Empowerment of Women (CEPEW), IDEA - Inclusive Development action (IDEA), LEA - LGBTQ Education Activists, Research center for Gender, Family and Environment in Development (CGFED), Hanoi, (Viet Nam);
JS6	**Joint submission 6 submitted by**: Gender-based Violence Prevention Network Vietnam, Hanoi (Viet Nam);
JS7	**Joint submission 7 submitted by**: CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation, VOICE: Voice Vietnam Civil Society Forum Human Rights Foundation, Johannesburg (South Africa);
JS8	**Joint submission 8 submitted by**: Vietnam UPR 2019 Working Group, Sacramento (The United States of America);
JS9	**Joint submission 9 submitted by**: Coalition of NGOs for UPR-Country Vietnam: The Research Centre for Gender, Family and Environment in Development (CGFED), The International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN), Supporters

	for the Health and Rights of Workers in the Semiconductor Industry (SHARPS), Korea Trans-National Corporation Watch (KTNC Watch), Hanoi, (Viet Nam);
JS10	**Joint submission 10 submitted by**: Boat People SOS, Inc., Falls Church, VA, (The United States of America);
JS11	**Joint submission 11 submitted by**: Coalition to Abolish Modern-day Slavery in Asia, Independent Journalist Association of Vietnam (IJAVN) and Boat People SOS (BPSOS), Falls Church, VA, (The United States of America);
JS12	**Joint submission 12 submitted by**: International Federation of Human Rights, Vietnam Committee on Human Rights, Paris (France);
JS13	**Joint submission 13 submitted by**: Next GEN, Hanoi, (Viet Nam);
JS14	**Joint submission 14 submitted by**: Mnet and its partners: Institute for Development and Community Health (LIGHT); Center for Development and Integration (CDI); Research Center for Gender-Family and Community Development (GFCD); Institute for Research on Policy, Law and Development (PLD) Vietnam Justice Support Association for the Poor (VIJUSAP); Social Work and Community Development Research Centre (SDRC); Center for family support and community development (CFSCD). Other NGO partners include Research Centre for Gender, Family and Environment in Development (CGFED) and Human Rights Space (HRS), Dich Vong Hau, (Viet Nam);
JS15	**Joint submission 15 submitted by**: Human Rights Space, The Cooperation Group for Governance and Public Administration Reform, Hanoi, (Viet Nam);
JS16	**Joint submission 16 submitted by**: Harm Reduction International, London (the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
JS17	**Joint submission 17 submitted by**: Legal Initiatives for Vietnam, ACAT France, Davis, (The United States of America);
JS18	**Joint submission 18 submitted by**: Boat People SOS Statelessness Network Asia Pacific Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion, Eindhoven (The Netherlands);
JS19	**Joint submission 19 submitted by**: Covenants Watch, Environmental Jurists Association, Taiwan Association for Human Rights, Vietnamese Migrant Workers and Brides Office, Taipei (China);
JS20	**Joint submission 20 submitted by**: Lawyers for Lawyers (L4L) Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada, Amsterdam (The Netherlands);

[2] The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR;
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty;
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW;
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child;

OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict;
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography;
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure;
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

[3] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras. 143.1-143.30.
[4] JS15, para. 1. See also JS8, para. 34, JS15, para. 8 and JS17, para. 47.
[5] JS19, para 7.
[6] JS14, para. 2(b).
[7] AI, page 5.
[8] AI, page 7.
[9] JS4, para. 31.
[10] JS9, page 1.
[11] A/HRC/26/6, Recommandation 143.16
[12] JS2, page 5.
[13] JS18, para. 31.10. See also JS18, paras. 10 and 4.
[14] JS9, page 7.
[15] JS14, para. 2(b). See also JS14, paras. 11(a), 14(d), 15(a) and 19(a).
[16] HRW, page 3.
[17] JS7, para 6.1.
[18] JS14, para. 2(b). See also JS14, paras. 11(a), 14(d), 15(a) and 19(a).
[19] JS9, page 6.
[20] UNPO, page 9.
[21] JS12, para 61.
[22] JS14, para. 3.
[23] JS15, para. 2.
[24] AI, page 5.
[25] FLD para 21.
[26] JS4, para. 31.
[27] JS13, p. 13.
[28] FLD para 21.
[29] WEA, para.14.
[30] JS15, para. 2.
[31] AI, page 5.
[32] ICAN p.1.
[33] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras. 143.31-143.46, 143.51-143.53, 143.66-143.76, 143.78-143.79, 143.173 and 174.
[34] A/HRC/26/6, paras. 143.36, 143. 37, 143. 38 and 143.39.
[35] JS15, para. 3. See also JS15, para. 1.
[36] JS4, para. 31.
[37] JS15, para. 4.
[38] ISCUF, pp. 1 –3.
[39] JS15, para. 1.
[40] VNAPC, pp. 2 – 5.
[41] VNAPC, pp. 7 – 8.
[42] VBF, para 4.
[43] JS12, para 54.
[44] JS10, para.3-5.
[45] WEA, para 20.
[46] JS7, para 6.1.
[47] WEA, paras.10 and 19.
[48] WEA, para 8.
[49] UNPO, page 9.
[50] JS9, page 3.
[51] JS7, para 6.1.

[52] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.86, 143.88.
[53] JS5, page 1.
[54] JS5, page 1.
[55] JS15, para. 6. See also JS15, para. 27.
[56] JS14, para. 4(a). See also A/HRC/26/6, para. 143.86.
[57] JS3, para. 1.2.
[58] JS3, para. 1.3.
[59] iSEE, pp. 1 – 3.
[60] JS15, para. 27. See also JS3, para. 3.1.
[61] iSEE, paras. 23 – 25.
[62] iSEE, para. 22.
[63] JS3, p. 4 and para. 4.1(a). See also JS13, p. 4 and JS15, para. 27.
[64] JS6, para 4.2.
[65] JS16, para. 2. See also JS16, para. 27.
[66] VAE2019, page 3.
[67] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.77, 143.216-143.218, 143.226 and 227.
[68] National Network of Indo China Activists para 24
[69] AIP, p. 2.
[70] AI, pages 3 and 5.
[71] JS19, para.22.
[72] CECR, p. 2.
[73] WARECOD, paras 1 and 3
[74] AAPSO, page 1
[75] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.89-143.118, 143.136 and 137
[76] REPRIEVE, pp. 2 – 6.
[77] AI, page 4, see also JS16, para. 8.
[78] AI, page 6.
[79] JS15, para. 8. See also JS17, para. 11.
[80] JS17, paras. 4 and 22 and JS16, p. 5, para. a). See also JS17, para. 47 and JS15, para. 8; AI, pages 6 and 7; JS12, para.62.
[81] JS15, para. 8. See also JS17, para. 47.
[82] JS16, p. 5, para. a). See also JS17, para. 47.
[83] VN-CAT, page 2.
[84] VPAFW, page 1.
[85] WEA, para.25.
[86] FLD, para 16.
[87] TSC, page 1.
[88] AI, pages 5 and 6.
[89] BPSOS, para 34.
[90] CSW, para 31.
[91] HRW, page 2.
[92] FN p.5.
[93] JS12, para 51.
[94] AI, page 6.
[95] BPSOS, page 2, para 12.
[96] VN-CAT, page 5.
[97] JS16, para. 13.
[98] JS17, para. 42.
[99] JS12, para 57.
[100] UNPO, page 9.
[101] JS8, para. 38.
[102] JS16, para. 19. See also JS16, para. 25.
[103] JS16, para. 19.
[104] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras. 143.50, 143.127-143.135.
[105] VPDF, para.1.
[106] JS15, para. 11.
[107] JS20, p. 9.
[108] HRW, page 2.
[109] HRW, page 5.
[110] VN-CAT, page 2.

[111] BPSOS, p[illegible] 35.
[112] VN-CAT, page 6.
[113] VPDF, para 9.
[114] JS17, para. 47.
[115] IELM, pg. 2 – 3.
[116] RTCCD, p. 1 – 2.
[117] UNJC, para. 5.
[118] For relevant recommendations A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.139-143.172, 143.175-143.179, 143.219.
[119] JS11, para. 40.
[120] JS11, para. 40 (b).
[121] JS20, para. 15.
[122] HRW, page 2.
[123] VNAPC, pp. 2 – 4; See also JS8, para.22.
[124] JS7, para. 2.2.
[125] JS8, para. 38.
[126] FLD para. 21.
[127] Access News, paras. 12 – 15.
[128] HRW, page 1.
[129] VNAPC, pp. 2 – 4.
[130] Access News, paras. 12 – 15.
[131] JS8, para. 3. See also JS8, para. 26 and JS20, para. 10.
[132] JS8, para. 13. See also JS15, para. 13.
[133] JS8, para. 13. See also JS8, para. 12 and JS15, para. 13.
[134] JS8, para. 15.
[135] WPC, page 3.
[136] JS15, para. 13.
[137] JS15, para. 13.
[138] JS7, para. 3.
[139] HRW, page 3.
[140] JS7, para 6.3.
[141] JS11, page 7.
[142] JS19, para.21.
[143] TSC, page 1.
[144] Access News, para. 16., and para. 20.
[145] JS11, para.40 (g).
[146] HRW, page 3.
[147] JS15, para. 12.
[148] FN p.5.
[149] FLD para. 21.
[150] RED Communication, chapter III, para.4.
[151] ADF, paras. 3 – 20.
[152] BPSOS, para.15.
[153] JS12, paras 37 and 38.
[154] JS7, para 7.8.
[155] CSW, p. 2.
[156] CSW, p. 3.
[157] ADF, p. 7.
[158] BPSOS, para 32.
[159] CSW, para 30.
[160] CSVC, page 2.
[161] JS10, para. 39.
[162] JS10, rec. 5.
[163] JS10, para 34.
[164] VN-CAT, page 4.
[165] WEA, para 22. See also JS10, para 34.
[166] JS7, para 1.7.
[167] JS15, para. 16.
[168] VNAPC, pp. 2 – 6.
[169] FLD, para 7.
[170] JS15, para. 16. See also JS15, p. 11.

[171] JS15, para. 19.
[172] JS5, page 3.
[173] JS15, para. 15.
[174] For relevant recommendations A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.122-143.126.
[175] CSDM, p. 3.
[176] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.138.
[177] Access Now, p. 2.
[178] Access Now, p. 5.
[179] JS18, para. 30.
[180] JS18, para. 31.8.
[181] JS3, para. 3.13. See also JS3, paras. 1.3(d) and 3.15; JS13, para. 1.1 and JS15, para. 26.
[182] JS3, p. 6 and para. 4.1(f). See also JS13, p. 6 and JS15, para. 27.
[183] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.180 and 181.
[184] JS14, para. 4.
[185] JS14, para. 14. See also JS14, para. 15 and A/HRC/26/6, para. 143.189.
[186] JS15, para. 17. See also JS14, para. 17.
[187] JS15, para. 17.
[188] DRI, p. 6.
[189] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.57, 143.187-143.190, 143.220-143.223, 143.225.
[190] VGCL, section I.
[191] AIPSO, page 4.
[192] VPC, para.4.
[193] AAPSO, page 1.
[194] CCDS, p. 2.
[195] CPAPD, para. 6.
[196] FMC, para.3.
[197] JS19, para.7.
[198] VAE2019, page 7.
[199] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.191 and 192.
[200] VAVA, page 1.
[201] VNRC, page 2.
[202] VAVA, page 2.
[203] JS4, para. 23.
[204] JS16, para. 10.
[205] JS16, p. 5, para. f).
[206] SCDI, pp. 1 –4.
[207] iSEE, paras. 20 – 21.
[208] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.58-143.65, 143.193-143.204, 143.224.
[209] JS1, para.12.
[210] VPC, para.5.
[211] JS15, para. 22.
[212] JS18, para. 31.9.
[213] CSHRS, para. 9.
[214] WPC, page 2.
[215] CHD, para. 8.
[216] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.80-143.85, 143.87, 143.119.
[217] CWDF, paras. 1 – 6.
[218] SRD, page 1.
[219] CPAPD, para. 5.
[220] AIPSO, page 4.
[221] CCDS, p. 2.
[222] VPC, para. 7.
[223] CSHRS, para. 8.
[224] JS4, para. 4.
[225] JS1, para.16.
[226] CWDF paras. 7 – 8.
[227] VWU, para.9.
[228] CWDF paras. 7 – 8.
[229] JS14, para. 6.

[230] JS5, page 6.
[231] JS14, para. 12.
[232] JS4, para 18.
[233] SRD, pp. 1 –2.
[234] VWU, para 9.
[235] JS6, para 3.10.
[236] VWU, para 9.
[237] JS6, para 4.6 and 4.7.
[238] FMC, para.5.
[239] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.47-143.49, 143.54-143.56, 143.120 and 121.
[240] JS2, para.22.
[241] JS2, page 8.
[242] JS19, para 14.
[243] RTCCD, p. 3.
[244] JS2, page 11.
[245] VACR, pp. 2 –6.
[246] CSDS, pp. 2 – 3.
[247] CPAPD, para. 5.
[248] JS1, para 17.
[249] GREACPC, para 2.1 and 2.6.
[250] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.205 and 206.
[251] Vrethealth, page 2.
[252] DRD p.2.
[253] Vrethealth, page 2.
[254] ASVDO, page 6.
[255] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.207-143-214.
[256] JS18, para. 15.
[257] CSDM, p. 3.
[258] CSDM, para 5.
[259] VPDF, para.10.
[260] TSC, pp. 4 –5.
[261] TSC, pp. 5 –6.
[262] KKF, pp. 1 –5.
[263] UNPO, pages 2-7, 9.
[264] KKF, page 5.
[265] JS18, para. 31.4.
[266] VPC, para.7.
[267] VFU, Section II, para.1.
[268] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/26/6/Add.1, paras.143.215.
[269] JS18, para. 31.5.
[270] JS18, para. 17.
[271] JS18, para. 31.6. See also JS14, para. 9.
[272] JS14, para. 9.
[273] JS9, page 2.